

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/785,656	MUNJED, MARY A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	RAMON O. RAMIREZ	3632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) RAMON O. RAMIREZ. (3)_____.
- (2) Rober Walter. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 01 February 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kordecki and Malone.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr Walter argues the combination is not proper since it would not be possible to attach element 22 of Koedecki to the weighted support of Malone. Mr Walter further argues that neither of the references by itself shows all the limitations of the claim; Kordecki does not show a comformable weighted support, and Malone does not show the bottle holder capable of moving back and forth. The examiner would considere these arguments upon the filing of a response to the Office Action mailed Nov 7, 2005.